

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9 are currently pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 9 have been amended.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner alleged that the claim language "M pieces of data at every M-point interval" and "on a-by-a basis in two parallel columns" is unclear.

Applicants respectfully submit that the meaning of the term "at every M-point interval" refers to "data sets each consisting of M data mutually separated by M points," as explained in paragraphs 0092 and 0105 in the specification.

Further, since $k = M \times k_1 + k_0$, the equation (1) indicates that it is necessary to fetch every M-th data from those inputted serially and supply them to the pipelines on the conditions that k_0 is fixed to a given value and that the value of k_1 varies in a range of "0" to "M-1"; this operation is performed by the data permutating circuit of the preceding stage." Therefore, to the respective pipeline FFT circuits, different sets of data at every M-point interval, respectively, has to be supplied from input data. Further, there are descriptions in 0075 and 0076 that "Since each group mentioned above is a data set including M point data contiguous time-serially, the permutating method in the preceding stage resides in collecting the data at the corresponding locations in M groups one by one to acquire a data set including M data apart by M points time-serially; however, because each pipeline FFT has two parallel inputs, it is to read the data simultaneously from two data groups; for enabling the simultaneous access, the memory is divided into banks so that odd-numbered data group and even-numbered data group can be stored in the different bank memories, respectively; from the individual banks, data are read out a by a sequentially, starting from the leading one, whereon two data stored in the two banks at the corresponding locations are supplied to one pipeline FFT as two parallel inputs; ordinarily, $2^b \geq 2^a$ applies valid; at this juncture, $2^b/a$ is represented by c (where c is a power of "2"); since the number of data required simultaneously is a of 2^b column data in each group, each column in each group is read c times with remainder being discarded.

The number of the pipeline FFT circuits which data should be supplied is "a." Therefore, the term "at every M-point interval" is changed to "data sets each consisting of M data mutually separated by M point," as indicated by the claim amendments. Further, the respective data in the same group is not at every M-point interval mutually.

Applicants have amended the claims to change the term "in two parallel columns" to "in parallel on a two-by-two data basis," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In claim 1, "a-by-a basis" means "a" sets with respect to plural sets including M point data, not "a-by-a basis with respect to individual data." Further, "in two parallel columns," is not data two-by-two basis simultaneously but parallel two data columns.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11-30-07

By:


Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501